

A100  
21 Sep 83

## MEMORANDUM FOR: THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Approval of Out-of-Cycle Promotions

1. [ ] IG Staff, called to ask where it was shown in the regulations the approval for out-of-cycle promotions. Advised her that there is no specific regulatory statement on the subject. The reason for this is that, when the uniform promotion schedule was established, at the direction of Adm. Turner, ~~xxxxxxx~~ the idea of promoting people outside the schedule had not occurred to anyone. It was some months afterward that the issue came up and we in OP devised a procedural mechanism to handle "out-of-cycle" promotions which technically should not exist. Currently, all components realize that a request to promote someone out of cycle must be submitted to D/Pers with an explanation and the Staff Personnel Division usually staffs out the case. Another reason we did not want to publish the "availability" of out-of-cycle promotions was to avoid [ ] an impression of encouraging them. In other words, Panels and Boards should be doing their homework and the issue should rarely appear. In reality, however, I am aware that it has been a fairly common experience -- Panels "forget" someone; they "forget" to look at some papers; they "didn't realize" how the system works; they were "not aware of the procedures", etc etc etc. A little sloppy work goes on it seems.

STAT

STAT

2. All of the foregoing only created more of a dilemma [ ] as the facts unfolded. It appears she is involved in settling a grievance which will involve an out-of-cycle promotion. Advised her no problem we have dealt with them in the past and the OP must sign off on the action in order to accomplish it. We normally do not question an IG settlement unless there is retroactivity involved and then there are some legal issues involved there. She was ~~ask~~ asking me how she should handle her case; i.e. to whom should she be writing her memo. Expressing great surprise that she was asking me how IG usually handles such things, I suggested she talk to one of her ~~supervisors~~ supervisors as to the standard IG procedure. She seemed reluctant to do so so I suggested that in my own personal opinion, it seemed to me she should be writing her memorandum of her findings back to the Career Service head involved, or the grievance officer, through her own IG chain of command. If the CS agrees with her conclusion, and assuming that they have the option to disagree, then I would assume she would submit the appropriate paper work to OP to accomplish the settlement.

STAT

STAT  
STAT

✓ Orig: PA/Promotion

1: PA/Grievance Cases

1: P&amp;PS chrono

1: i

## ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

Date

10 AUG 1982

TO: (Name, office symbol, room number,  
building, Agency/Post)

Initials

Date

1. DD/Pers/PA&amp;E

10 AUG 1982

B

2. C/P&amp;PS

3.

4.

5.

Action	File	Note and Return
Approval	For Clearance	Per Conversation
As Requested	For Correction	Prepare Reply
Circulate	For Your Information	See Me
Comment	Investigate	Signature
Coordination	Justify	

## REMARKS

[ ] DD/Pers would appreciate your comments as to legality etc.

We will not proceed until we have the advantage of reviewing your thoughts.

[ ] we find no technical problems with the attached. They have addressed the 2-year limit on back pay; and we find no limitations in references concerning solutions reached after retirement. (One does have to wonder why it has taken 4 years to solve this one---)

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)

Exec Asst to D/Pers

Room No.—Bldg.

Phone No.

5041-102

OPTIONAL FORM 41 (Rev. 7-76)  
Prescribed by GSA  
FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.206

\* GPO : 1981 O - 341-529 (120)

STAT

STAT  
SIAISTAT  
SIAI